

Dear FCC,

My name is Andrew Alexander Pilling and I live in San Marcos, TX.

Net neutrality, the principle that Internet service providers (ISPs) treat all data that travels over their networks equally, is important to me because without it ISPs could have too much power to determine my Internet experience by providing better access to some services but not others.

A pay-to-play Internet worries me because new, innovative services that can't afford expensive fees for better service will be less likely to succeed.

I'm going to share what I've already written to commissioner Pai:

Commissioner Pai,

I just saw you quoted as saying "The Internet was free and open before the FCC adopted net neutrality rules," [...] "It remains free and open today. Net neutrality has always been a solution in search of a problem."

I seriously hope you were either misquoted or taken completely out of context as those quotes suggest you are unaware that internet services were classified as common carriers up until they were reclassified under previous chairman Powell's leadership. There's a term called "the Revolving Door" when people talk about the corruption in Washington these days... who is providing Michael's much higher salary now that he is no longer Chairman of the FCC?

As for Net Neutrality being a solution in search of a problem, if you are being quoted correctly, you've clearly not studied the history of the United States of America. The citizens of our nation have gone through these same battles before concerning electric utilities, rail road practices, and telecommunications. The very organization you serve as a commissioner for was created by the Communications Act of 1934 as a direct address to these very trends; of specific context - discriminatory pricing. To say that net neutrality is a solution in search of a problem is to say that you are grossly unaware of the context of the very organization you serve as a commissioner for. I really hope your quotes were taken out of context.

As for "free and open today", I'm not going to try and rewrite an already well documented subject. Here's one link out of many:
<http://whatisnetneutrality.org/timeline>

Anjit, internet service providers claim they won't violate the principles of an open internet but they hire lawyers to litigate against any legal standards for an open internet, and they pay lobbyists and make both hard and soft campaign contributions to law makers in exchange for tacit promises to gut the FCC's budget if the FCC ever reclassifies Internet service back to the common carrier service (i.e. a utility) that it has always been and only increases to be.

So publicly they say one thing but in their actions they're clearly saying pretty much the opposite. I don't always catch when I'm being lied to but I'm pretty sure we can all see what's going on here. Why would they invest so much effort for the right to do something if they weren't going to do it? Why would patents be filed for tiered discriminatory pricing schemes if those weren't an option being considered?

There are other factors to the situation, particularly attracting the investments wanted to build out infrastructure and the flexibility to address abuse and misalignments of internet services. Make a study of the validity of those claims and articulate them for what they are rather than making the brazenly compromised statements as you were quoted to have made above. As it is, I really wouldn't be surprised to find you following in Michael Powell's footsteps, which would be a sad discredit to what you have to offer the world.

7522789064.txt

Commissioner Pai, please have respect for the role and trust our nation has bestowed upon you. Don't live it down by succumbing to unfulfilling promises and spreading grossly off-handed misrepresentations.

Sincerely,

Andrew Alexander Pilling